

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
Phone: (703) 205-8000  
Fax: (703) 205-8050  
(703) 698-8590 (GIV)

**Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP**

# Fax

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAR 04 2005

**To:** Examiner S. Ham **From:** Joe McKinney Muncy  
Reg. No. 32,334

---

**Fax:** 703-872-9306 **Date:** March 4, 2003

---

**Phone:** **Pages:** Three (3) (including cover sheet)

---

**Your Ref.:** Serial No. 10/748,213 **Our Ref.:** 2519-0129P

---

**Re:** **CC:**

---

**Urgent**  **For Review**  **Please Comment**  **Please Reply**  **Please Recycle**

---

This transmission is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or duplication of this transmission by someone other than the intended addressee or its designated agent is strictly prohibited. If your receipt of this transmission is in error, please notify this firm immediately by collect call to (703) 205-8000, and send the original transmission to us by return mail at the address above.

---

**Comments:** Examiner Ham: Further to my telephone message, attached is an explanation about changes made to the above-identified application by Examiner's Amendment. We think the one of the changes should NOT have been made and would now like to file a 312 Amendment for correction. Please contact us about this matter - 703-205-8000.

**FOR INTERVIEW PURPOSES ONLY - DO NOT ENTER INTO FILE**

Page 1 of 3

Page 2 of 3

Inventors: **TSAI, Ming-Chih**Serial No.: **10/748,213**

DO NOT

Docket No.: **2519-0129PUS1**

ENTER

Our Ref.: **NP-3363-US**

FOR INTERVIEW

For: **Electromagnetic Interference Filter**

PURPOSES

We are pleased to receive the fax that informs us the above-identified application will be allowed. The examiner allows this application but requests some amendment according to the fax.

Applicant agrees to replace "thin-film" by "film" in Claims 1, 3, and 5. However, applicant does not agree to change "not connected" to "connected" in Claims 19 and 20 because the other terminal of the grounded wire is not connected to the metallic film area of the second surface. There is a misunderstanding about the terminal of the grounded wire, and now we suggest changing the terminal of the grounded wire to the other terminal of the grounded wire in Claims 19 and 20 to distinguish one terminal of the grounded wire in Claim 5 from the other terminal of the grounded wire in Claims 19 and 20.

Actually, the grounded wire includes two terminals and one is

page 3 of 3

connected to the metallic film area of the second surface and the other one is not connected to the metallic film area of the second surface. In addition, the terminal of the wires of the inductance coil and the other terminal of the grounded wire are facing toward a direction that is parallel to the ceramic capacitance board.

We suggest amending Claims 19 and 20 as follows:

Claim 19. The electromagnetic interference filter of claim 5, wherein the terminal of the wires of the inductance coil and the other terminal, not connected to the metallic film area of the second surface, of the grounded wire ~~not connected to the metallic film area of the second surface~~ are facing toward a direction that is parallel to the ceramic capacitance board.

Claim 20. The electromagnetic interference filter of claim 5, wherein the terminal of the wires of the inductance coil and the other terminal, not connected to the metallic film area of the second surface, of the grounded wire ~~not connected to the metallic film area of the second surface~~ are facing toward a direction that is perpendicular to the ceramic capacitance board.

DO NOT ENTER  
For interview purposes